



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, DC 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
087659,952	06/07/96	LUDWIG	VCOR-001/090

LM21/0519  
COOLEY GODWARD CASTRO HUDDLESON & TATUM  
FIVE PALO ALTO SQUARE  
3000 EL CAMINO REAL  
PALO ALTO CA 94306

EXAMINER  
KIM, K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER  
2782

DATE MAILED: 05/19/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Please See attached Interview Summary.

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
08/659,952

Applicant(s)  
Ludwig et al.

Examiner  
Ki Kim

Group Art Unit  
2782

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ki Kim (PTO)

(3) Mr. Craig Opperman (Attorney Of Record)

(2) Mr. Dung Dinh (PTO)

(4) Mr. Lester Ludwig (Applicant)

Date of Interview May 14, 1998

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 2

Identification of prior art discussed:

Vin et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

1) The Applicant presented an argument that Vin reference does not show the "callhandle" as defined by Applicant's disclosure. However, the Examiner and the Applicant agreed that the current language of claim 2 does not adequately define the "callhandle" feature of Applicant's invention. Examiner indicated that, when an amendment of claim 2 properly defining the feature is submitted, a further search would be performed for the feature.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.